

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 to 17, 19 to 33 and 35 to 48 were pending in the Application at the time of examination. The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by the Stewart et al. reference (US 6,259,405).

The Examiner rejected Claims 3, 5, 10, 15, 16, 19, 21, 26, 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Stewart et al. reference (US 6,259,405) in view of the Waites reference (US 6,788,769). The Examiner rejected Claims 33, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 45 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Stewart et al. reference (US 6,259,405) in view of the Harter et al reference. The Examiner rejected Claims 35, 37, 42, 47 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Stewart et al. reference (US 6,259,405) in view of the Harter et al reference and further in view of the Waites reference (US 6,788,769).

Claims 1, 3 to 17, 19 to 33 and 35 to 48 remain in the Application.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, AND 30 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(E)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by the Stewart et al. reference (US 6,259,405).

Applicants' Claim 1 reads as follows, with emphasis added:

A method for device location sensitive data routing comprising:  
detecting a signal at a location wherein said signal emanates from a portable, electronic device

wherein said signal contains a user identifier  
wherein said user identifier identifies a user;  
transmitting via a phone system to a routing  
device said user identifier and a list of one or more  
communications devices wherein said communications  
devices are at said location; and  
rerouting one or more electronic communications  
to said communications devices wherein said  
electronic communications are intended for said user.

Applicants' Claim 3, as amended, reads as follows, with  
emphasis added:

A method for device location sensitive data  
routing comprising:  
detecting a signal at a location wherein said  
signal emanates from a portable, electronic device  
wherein said signal contains a user identifier  
wherein said user identifier identifies a user;  
transmitting via e-mail to a routing device said  
user identifier and a list of one or more  
communications devices wherein said communications  
devices are at said location; and  
rerouting one or more electronic communications  
to said communications devices wherein said  
electronic communications are intended for said user.

Applicants' Claim 17, as amended, reads as follows, with  
emphasis added:

A device location sensitive data router  
comprising:  
a detector configured to detect a signal at a  
location wherein said signal emanates from a  
portable, electronic device wherein said signal  
contains a user identifier wherein said user  
identifier identifies a user;  
a transmitter configured to transmit via a phone  
system said user identifier and a list of one or more  
communications devices wherein said communications  
devices are at said location; and

a routing device configured to receive said list and said user identifier wherein said routing device is further configured to reroute one or more electronic communications to said communications devices wherein said electronic communications are intended for said user.

Applicants' Claim 19, as amended, reads as follows, with emphasis added:

A device location sensitive data router comprising:

a detector configured to detect a signal at a location wherein said signal emanates from a portable, electronic device wherein said signal contains a user identifier wherein said user identifier identifies a user;

a transmitter configured to transmit via e-mail said user identifier and a list of one or more communications devices wherein said communications devices are at said location; and

a routing device configured to receive said list and said user identifier wherein said routing device is further configured to reroute one or more electronic communications to said communications devices wherein said electronic communications are intended for said user.

As shown above, Applicants independent Claims 1, 3, 17 and 19, as amended, recite either transmissions of user identifier and a list of one or more communications devices made by a phone system (Claims 1 and 17) or by e-mail (Claims 3 and 19).

The Examiner has stated that the Stewart reference discloses the use of a phone system and/or e-mail for

transmission at Stewart Column 2, line 50 to column 3, line 3.  
Stewart Column 2, line 50 to column 3, line 3 reads as follows:

A mobile user (MU) may use a portable computing device (PCD) to connect to the network and access information or services from the network. The PCD of the mobile user may connect to an access point in a wired or wireless fashion. The PCD may be configured to transmit a signal indicating a presence of the PCD as well as identification information indicating the mobile user. Each of the plurality of access points may be configured to independently detect the signal and may also be configured to receive the identification information indicating the user of the PCD.

Upon detection of the wireless signal by a first access point in proximity to the PCD, and upon receipt of the identification information indicating the user of the PCD, the first access point may transmit the identification information, as well as the known geographic location of the first access point, to one or more providers on the network. The known geographic location of the first access point indicates the approximate location of the PCD of the mobile user. The first access point may also transmit the known geographic location to a memory associated with the PCD, thereby advising the PCD of its location.

Applicants respectfully submit that the passage above, cited by the Examiner, fails to disclose, teach, suggest, or even mention, transmission of user identifier and a list of one or more communications devices by either a phone system or e-mail as recited in Applicants' Claims 1, 3, 17 and 19. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to show where in the Stewart reference it is

disclosed, taught or suggested that transmissions are made by a phone system (Claims 1 and 17) or by e-mail (Claims 3 and 19).

In light of the discussion above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 3, 17 and 19, as amended, under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Claims 4 to 16 depend, directly or indirectly on Claim 1. Consequently, Claims 4 to 16 include all of the features and limitations of Claim 1, as amended. Therefore, in light of the discussion above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13 and 14.

Claims 20 to 32 depend, directly or indirectly on Claim 17. Consequently, Claims 20 to 32 include all of the features and limitations of Claim 17, as amended. Therefore, in light of the discussion above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, and 30.

**REJECTION OF CLAIMS 3, 5, 10, 15, 16, 19, 21, 26, 31 AND  
32 UNDER 35 103(A)**

The Examiner rejected Claims 3, 5, 10, 15, 16, 19, 21, 26, 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Stewart et al. reference (US 6,259,405) in view of the Waites reference (US 6,788,769).

The addition of the Waites reference does nothing to cure the basic deficiency of the Stewart reference discussed above. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to show where in the Stewart reference, the Waites reference, or any combination of the Stewart reference and the Waites reference it is disclosed, taught or suggested that transmissions are made by a phone system (Claims 1 and 17) or by e-mail (Claims 3 and 19)

Claims 4 to 16 depend, directly or indirectly on Claim 1. Consequently, Claims 4 to 16 include all of the features and limitations of Claim 1, as amended. Therefore, in light of the discussion above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 5, 10, 15, and 16.

Claims 20 to 32 depend, directly or indirectly on Claim 17. Consequently, Claims 20 to 32 include all of the features and limitations of Claim 17, as amended. Therefore, in light of the discussion above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 21, 26, 31 and 32.

**REJECTION OF CLAIMS 33, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 45 AND 46**  
**UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(A)**

The Examiner rejected Claims 33, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 45 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Stewart et al. reference (US 6,259,405) in view of the Harter et al reference.

Applicants' Claim 33 reads as follows, with emphasis added:

A computer program product comprising:  
a computer usable medium having computer  
readable program code embodied therein configured to  
route data, said computer program product comprising:  
computer readable code configured to cause a  
computer to detect a signal at a location wherein  
said signal emanates from a portable, electronic  
device wherein said signal contains a user identifier  
wherein said user identifier identifies a user;  
computer readable code configured to cause a  
computer to transmit via a phone system said user  
identifier and a list of one or more communications

devices wherein said communications devices are at said location to a routing device; and

computer readable code configured to cause a computer to reroute one or more electronic communications to said communications devices wherein said electronic communications are intended for said user.

Applicants' Claim 35, as amended, reads as follows, with emphasis added:

A computer program product comprising:

a computer usable medium having computer readable program code embodied therein configured to route data, said computer program product comprising:

computer readable code configured to cause a computer to detect a signal at a location wherein said signal emanates from a portable, electronic device wherein said signal contains a user identifier wherein said user identifier identifies a user;

computer readable code configured to cause a computer to transmit via e-mail said user identifier and a list of one or more communications devices wherein said communications devices are at said location to a routing device; and

computer readable code configured to cause a computer to reroute one or more electronic communications to said communications devices wherein said electronic communications are intended for said user.

As shown above, Applicants independent Claims 33 and 35, as amended, recite either transmissions of user identifier and a

list of one or more communications devices made by a phone system (Claim 33) or by e-mail (Claim 35).

The Examiner has stated that the Stewart reference discloses the use of a phone system and/or e-mail for transmission at Stewart Column 2, line 50 to column 3, line 3. Stewart Column 2, line 50 to column 3, line 3 reads as follows:

A mobile user (MU) may use a portable computing device (PCD) to connect to the network and access information or services from the network. The PCD of the mobile user may connect to an access point in a wired or wireless fashion. The PCD may be configured to transmit a signal indicating a presence of the PCD as well as identification information indicating the mobile user. Each of the plurality of access points may be configured to independently detect the signal and may also be configured to receive the identification information indicating the user of the PCD.

Upon detection of the wireless signal by a first access point in proximity to the PCD, and upon receipt of the identification information indicating the user of the PCD, the first access point may transmit the identification information, as well as the known geographic location of the first access point, to one or more providers on the network. The known geographic location of the first access point indicates the approximate location of the PCD of the mobile user. The first access point may also transmit the known geographic location to a memory associated with the PCD, thereby advising the PCD of its location.

Applicants respectfully submit that the passage above, cited by the Examiner, fails to disclose, teach, suggest, or



even mention, transmission of user identifier and a list of one or more communications devices by either a phone system or e-mail as recited in Applicants' Claims 33 and 35. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to show where in the Stewart reference it is disclosed, taught or suggested that transmissions are made by a phone system (Claim 33) or by e-mail (Claim 35).

The addition of the Harter et al reference does nothing to cure the basic deficiency of the Stewart reference discussed above. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to show where in the Stewart reference, the Harter et al reference, or any combination of the Stewart reference and the Harter et al reference, it is disclosed, taught, or suggested transmissions made by a phone system (Claim 33) or by e-mail (Claim 35).

In light of the discussion above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 33 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 36 to 48 depend, directly or indirectly on Claim 33. Consequently, Claims 36 to 48 include all of the features and limitations of Claim 33, as amended. Therefore, in light of the discussion above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 45 and 46.

**REJECTION OF CLAIMS 35, 37, 42, 47 AND 48 UNDER 35 U.S.C.**  
**103(A)**

The Examiner rejected Claims 35, 37, 42, 47 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Stewart et al. reference (US 6,259,405) in view of the Harter et al reference and further in view of the Waites reference (US 6,788,769).

The addition of the Harter et al reference does nothing to cure the basic deficiency of the Stewart and the Waites

references discussed above. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that Examiner has failed to show where in the Stewart reference, the Waites reference, the Harter et al reference, or any combination of the Stewart reference, the Waites reference, and the Harter et al reference, it is disclosed, taught, or suggested transmissions made by a phone system (Claim 33) or by e-mail (Claim 35)


Claims 36 to 48 depend, directly or indirectly on Claim 33. Consequently, Claims 36 to 48 include all of the features and limitations of Claim 33, as amended. Therefore, in light of the discussion above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 37, 42, 47 and 48.

#### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicants.


#### **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on July 30, 2007.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

July 30, 2007  
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

  
Philip J. McKay  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 38,966  
Tel.: (831) 655-0880